DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 678 HE 008 733

AUTHOR	Elliott, T. Michael; And Others
TITLE	A College-Related Church. United Methodist Perspectives.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education, Nashville, Tenn.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	63p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Office of Information and Publications, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Freedom; *Church Related Colleges; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Opportunities; Educational Quality; Higher Education; Individual Development; *Liberal Arts; *Private Colleges; *Religious Education; Values
IDENTIFIERS	*United Methodist Church

ABSTRACT

Part One is an official statement on the mission of the United Methodist Church in its institutions of higher education, and asserts several reasons for the church's direct involvement in colleges and universities. That statement is supported by the four concept papers in Part Two. From a theological perspective, because the world is knowable and is the expression of God's Being and Will, the Christian should seek to understand the world. The Wesleyan tradition and heritage in education is one of concern for the education of all persons, regardless of ethnic, economic, or social background. The United Methodist Church places high value on the individual's spiritual, intellectual, esthetic, emotional, and physical resources. Liberal arts education is supported as the best means of developing these capacities. Church-related institutions should emphasize value-centered inquiry. Institutions independent of the state, including colleges and universities, help to maintain personal and political freedom. Independent colleges can more readily serve the needs of particular ethnic, regional, or religious groups, therefore helping to maintain cultural pluralism diversity in educational opportunities, encourage educational excellence, and provide a bulwark against potential state infringement of academic freedom. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136678

A College-Related Church

United Methodist Perspectives

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Commission on Higher Education
United Methodist H. E.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION

MEMBERSHIP

PAUL HARDIN
President, Drew University
Chairman

JAMES C. CORMAN
U. S. Congressman, California

AUGUST W. EBERLE
Professor of Higher Education
Indiana University

LLOYD C. ELAM
President, Meharry Medical College

RICHARD C. GERHAN
Professor of Economics
Baldwin-Wallace College

THOMAS K. KIM
President, McMurry College

JOHN F. MURPHY
Executive Secretary, College and University Department, National Catholic Educational Association

WILLA B. PLAYER
Director, Division of College Support, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

ROBERT RANKIN
Vice President, The Danforth Foundation

ROY B. SHILLING, JR.
President, Hendrix College

JOHN R. SILBER
President, Boston University

HARRY E. SMITH
Executive Director, Society for Values in Higher Education

ELMER B. STAATS
Comptroller General of the United States

RALPH M. TANNER
Professor of History
Birmingham-Southern College

CAROLYN WARNER
Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Education, Arizona

D. FREDERICK WERTZ
Resident Bishop, West Virginia Area
The United Methodist Church

STAFF

T. MICHAEL ELLIOTT
Executive Director

RENÉE G. LOEFFLER
Associate Director

KENT M. WEEKS
Associate Director

DIANE DILLARD
Assistant to the Director

National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education
Suite 925, 1808 West End Building
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
615/329-9393

A College-Related Church

United Methodist Perspectives

National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

Copyright © 1976

National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education
Suite 925, 1808 West End Building
Nashville, Tennessee

This document is National Commission document CD-68.

Until June, 1977, limited additional copies of this volume may be obtained by writing the Commission offices. After that time, requests should be addressed to the Office of Information and Publications, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, P. O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword 6

Introduction 7

PART ONE

The Mission of The United Methodist Church in Its Institutions of Higher Education 11

PART TWO

A Theological Basis for Higher Education 27

Institutions of Higher Education and The United Methodist Church: A Unique Tradition 35

Liberal Arts Education in Colleges of the Church 41

Cultural Pluralism and Educational Diversity 53

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education was established by the Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church in January, 1975. The National Commission's work consists of five broad areas of investigation:

1. An analysis of church policy with respect to The United Methodist Church's involvement in higher education through related institutions, campus ministries, and the support services of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry.

2. An analysis of the environment in which higher education functions and in which it will function in the future, including social, economic, and demographic trends which will affect independent higher education and the church.

3. An analysis of public policy and legal issues related to institutional/state and church/state relationships. Alternative social goals for public policy will be examined along with strategies to implement such goals.

4. An analysis of institutional goals, problems, organizational relationships, support structures, and institutional health, including modeling of effects of alternative church and public policies.

5. An analysis of the current system of campus ministries, including goals, problems, organizational relationships and support structures.

Recommendations based on these analyses will be developed for the appropriate constituencies including public policy makers, institutions, campus ministries, and church members and officials.

Recognizing that many of the problems and concerns the National Commission will be addressing are not peculiarly United Methodist but involve all of independent and especially church-related higher education, an *Interdenominational Advisory Group* to the National Commission was formed. The *Interdenominational Advisory Group* consists of staff from the following:

African Methodist Episcopal Church
American Baptist Church
American Lutheran Church
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
Lutheran Church in America
Lutheran Educational Conference of North America
National Catholic Education Assn.
National Council of Churches
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
Southern Baptist Convention
United Churches of Christ
United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Representatives from the above denominations and organizations have committed their time to the work of the National Commission and are sources of information and insight.

The National Commission is an extraordinary organization in several respects. First, the National Commission is a true *ad hocracy*, designed to self-destruct at the end of two and a half years. No resources will be expended to perpetuate either the Commission or positions for its staff. Second, the National Commission's charge was totally open-ended. There are no *a priori* conclusions or commitments to the status quo in United Methodist higher education with respect to either campus ministries or institutions. Even the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, the Commission's parent organization, has opened itself to examination and evaluation by the National Commission. Third, the National Commission staff are independent-minded generalists in higher education. They are committed to rigorous scholarship in the conduct of the various research studies and the formulation of the National Commission policy recommendations. Finally, the National Commission membership is a highly diversified group of persons each having achieved distinction in his or her own right. This collective experience and wisdom constitute an extraordinary resource committed to what is probably the most comprehensive study ever undertaken by any denomination of its interest and investment in higher education.

FOREWORD

How important is diversity in American higher education? What is the role of church-related institutions in maintaining that diversity? What, indeed, is a church-related college or university? How important is it that the various denominations give substantial financial support to "their" colleges and universities? Do they or should they have any features which set them apart from secular institutions? If so, what features? How does the maintenance of such institutions contribute to diversity in higher education?

These and other like questions have been and are the grist for the research and conversational mills of the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education. One readily sees that these are not narrow denominational questions, but questions which affect all religious denominations and faiths and which, in the long run, affect all the institutions of higher learning in the United States. Fittingly, then, the National Commission has included in its membership persons of various denominations and faiths and has made interdenominational consultation a principal tool of its labors. The Commission is creature but not captive of The United Methodist Church. The more than 100 United Methodist-related institutions of higher learning have constituted a convenient representative sampling of institutions, for which we have substantial data, but we have sought to make our inquiries and conclusions broadly useful.

This first volume of Commission papers deals with church-related colleges and universities and speaks directly to the purpose of The United Methodist Church in being involved in higher education. Other topics will be covered in subsequent publications. Anyone who has worked in the commission format knows that the work product is the joint responsibility of full-time staff and the volunteers who serve as commission members. I want to thank Mike Elliott and the other members of the staff for working so diligently and effectively in preparing papers for our discussion and in amending them to reflect those discussions. I want to thank the members of the Commission for attending meetings faithfully, for doing their homework, and for pulling no punches in responding to staff work and to each other. We have tried hard to come to grips with the issues and say things that go beyond standard canards. We'll keep trying in subsequent reports and will welcome the response of readers.

9 Paul Hardin

INTRODUCTION

This is the first volume of a series of publications planned by the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education. The title, *A College-Related Church*, reflects a unique characteristic of The United Methodist Church and its historical relationship to colleges. The adoption by the General Conference of the statement in Part One of this volume marks a reaffirmation of the commitment of The United Methodist Church to the support of the institutions of higher education to which it is related. The contents describe not what it means for a college to be church-related, but what it means for a church to be college-related: a statement of the mission of The United Methodist Church in higher education. As such this volume can form the basis for the United Methodist-related colleges and their respective annual conferences to examine their diverse, individual relationships and thus to improve understandings of institutional mission in related colleges.

Part One of this volume is a formal statement of the National Commission. Part Two includes four staff papers which together constitute an elaboration of the main themes of the adopted statement: theological basis for church presence in higher education, the tradition of higher education in United Methodism, the value of liberal arts curricula in church-related colleges, and the church's role in maintaining cultural pluralism and educational diversity through support of related institutions of higher education.

There are many to whom the Commission and staff are indebted for their assistance in preparing these materials. Dr. John W. Harris, formerly a member of the staff of the National Commission, had a primary involvement in early drafts of several of the staff papers. The theological perspective paper was prepared by Dr. F. Thomas Trotter, General Secretary of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, for the National Commission. In addition, many others reviewed drafts of the several papers and corresponded or met in consultation with Commission staff. They include: J. Hamby Barton, Jr.; M. Francis Christy; Merrimon Cuninggim; Carl M. Dibble; Sandra J. Edwards; Loretta Glaze Elliott; W. Cecil Findley; Neal Bond Fleming; John P. Geary; Fred E. Harris; John D. Humphrey; Seymour W. Itzkoff; Elden E. Jacobson; John D. Millett; David G. Mobberley; Manning M. Pattillo, Jr.; Phil Phenix; David Riesman; Robert W. Thornburg; F. Thomas Trotter; Karen Hanke Weeks; Judith L. Weid-

man; Thomas W. West; and Myron F. Wicke. To all of these we acknowledge our debt and express our gratitude.

The many revisions and editions of the several manuscripts produced have required the skill and patience of an outstanding clerical staff. Commission secretaries Mrs. Penny Gupte and Ms. Toni Flynn have provided excellent service, the latter especially providing valuable editorial assistance. Mrs. Frances Graham, the Commission's office manager, has been responsible for orchestrating the total production effort in an exceptional manner. Graphic designer and layout artist for National Commission publications is Hermann F. Zimmermann of Design-Graphics, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee.

While the contributions of all those mentioned above have been invaluable, in the final analysis it is the National Commission, in the instance of Part One, and the National Commission staff in the instance of the papers of Part Two, who must accept full responsibility for the contents printed therein. Our success will ultimately be measured by the extent to which these papers are utilized by institutions, annual conferences and others in developing future policy both for the church and for the colleges.

T. Michael Elliott

The statement reproduced here was adopted by the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education on March 1, 1976. It was subsequently approved by the Executive Committee of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church. On May 4, 1976, the 1976 General Conference of The United Methodist Church, assembled in Portland, Oregon, adopted the statement as a statement of the whole church.

PART ONE

The Mission of the United Methodist Church in Its Institutions of Higher Education

After thorough review and discussion, the National Commission agreed that the most impelling reasons for The United Methodist Church to continue direct relationships with institutions of higher education are due to its:

- Theological perspective;
- Wesleyan tradition and heritage in higher education;
- Concern for a liberally educated laity and clergy;
- Concern for value-centered inquiry;
- Concern for the empowerment of the individual through liberal arts education;
- Commitment to cultural pluralism and educational diversity.

The following statement is set forth as normative, describing the hope and the ideal of a college or university related to The United Methodist Church. Further, the statement is consistent with the United Methodist tradition of theological pluralism as set forth in the *1972 Book of Discipline* (paragraph 70, section 3). In curriculum, campus style, and care for students, institutions of higher education related to the church reflect respect for reason, experience, tradition, and Scripture. This statement is asserted in full knowledge that current practice does not fully meet the ideal but with faith in the integrity of the institutions to work toward its full realization.

United Methodist Theological Perspective on Higher Education

The United Methodist Church is in higher education because it is the nature of the church to express itself in the intellectual love of God. For the United Methodist and Christian, explicit is the assumption that the world is knowable and is the expression of God's Being and Will. For the Christian, there must be a response to the implications of this world viewed in terms of human events. The "purpose" of church-related institutions is deeply and inextricably related to reflection on the "pur-

pose" of God. That is the heart of the "theological" rationale for church institutions.

The problem of stating a theological rationale for higher education is a complex one. Not only has the institution of the university itself changed, but ways of thinking about God have been altered so profoundly that even institutions with close historic ties with the church have been cut off from the theologies that sparked their origins.

Theology may be defined as reflecting upon the nature of God and speaking about God in intelligent and faithful ways. In the Judeo-Christian tradition of the West, the fundamental theological assertion is the idea of "creation"—a belief in a good and purposeful creator who is the source and sustainer of values. The world has been "created" in the sense that this good earth was intended by the creator to be the arena of God where persons would so live in its ecology that they would worship and "enjoy" God forever. Thus, fundamental to all theistic statements are the ideas of joy, responsibility, care for the world, love of neighbor, and a lively sense of wholeness (holiness) of all things. This story obviously is a faithful metaphor, growing out of the consciousness of purpose and elaborated by the "pre-scientific" story tellers of Israel. The biblical language contains a necessary and powerful element in religious tradition. The Jewish *Shema Yisroel*, "There is one God," is an expression of this coherence and confidence.

The story is elaborated by the teaching of the "Fall," the symbol of the empirical observation that the world appears to have been seriously deflected from the purposes of intentionality of the creator. The purpose of God has been obscured. Faith in those intentions is now tested by the alienation of humanity from God. Joy is replaced by despair, responsibility by self-centeredness, care by distraction, love by hate, and wholeness by fragmentation. The wisdom literature of Israel is essentially the argument with God over this pathetic state of the world. Exodus, Covenant, Exile become the literary and historical "explanations" and arguments for restoration of the good intention of God's plan for creation.

The content of Christian "revelation" is the assertion that creation is set in the direction of wholeness by the person of Jesus of Nazareth. His teaching is continuous with the traditions of Israel, especially in the prophetic accent. His crucifixion is the intersection of the best intentions of God with the worst intentions of humanity. The cross is the mid-point in the history of the argument with God. The Resurrection is the moment of assurance that the purposes of God are intact. The theology of the New

Testament is the statement of the church's conviction that the good creation, now flawed by sin, is restored by the Christ-event and humanity's obedient response. The fulfillment of the intention of God through creation is the touchstone of Christian faith and the norm of all Christian ethical and institutional existence.

In this tradition, learning becomes ideally an act of worship and joy. It becomes a gesture of human response to a knowable and good world. Persistent in the scriptural tradition are themes such as "knowing," "seeing," and "learning" in the context of which "believing," "acting," and "loving" are counterpoint. Charles Wesley's Kingswood School hymn seeks, in the midst of 18th century rationalism, to celebrate the "reuniting" of the elements so long separated—knowledge, learning, and truth with vital piety, holiness, and love.

A major problem today in higher education is that we have inherited the tradition of learning as utilitarian but have lost the tradition of learning as leading to "wisdom" in the theological sense. Higher education is a joyless affair for most in our time. For the Christian, education ought to be the highest joy because it is an act of the acknowledgement of the freedom for us to be what God intends us to be. Jesus is spoken of as "the Truth." "Know the Truth and the Truth will make you free." Pauline insistence upon the priority of faith in the freedom of humanity to be alive in the world becomes the basis for renewal in the Reformation period and the Wesleyan revival, both of which opened new surges of learning and responsibility for care of the world.

If we argue only on utilitarian lines, then the argument for continued and expanded church interest in higher education is weak. But if we argue on faithful theological premises, from the biblical story, the New Testament sense of liberation in the Gospel, and the uses of the intellect as an act of thanksgiving and praise, then profound necessities for the church's life in higher education are evident.

The church then, to take seriously its intellectual work, participates through institutional structures. These models of institutional life should reflect faith, knowledge, and joy. The crucial problem is for The United Methodist Church to decide if it values intellectual life sufficiently to continue its responsibilities in higher education.

For The United Methodist Church to abandon its colleges and universities would be to confess that it no longer cares for the question of the knowl-

edge of God or for its responsibility to model communities of humane learning and vital piety in society. The church needs its institutions of higher education. The necessity of the church's involvement in higher education can be found in a tradition which sees God as a source of human freedom and in which learning is the acknowledgement of God's purpose for humanity. The intellectual love of God requires for the life of The United Methodist Church that the church sponsor, support, and sustain its institutions of higher education.

Wesleyan Tradition and Heritage in Higher Education

"Unite the pair so long disjoined—knowledge and vital piety," wrote Charles Wesley. And it was no accident of history that in 1784 the Christmas Conference, at which the Methodist Church in America was established, as one of its first acts authorized the establishment of Cokesbury College in Abingdon, Maryland. Cokesbury, modeled on Kingswood School established by John Wesley in England in 1748, opened its doors on December 6, 1787. Cokesbury College marked the beginning of the church's commitment to education. In a sense, however, Cokesbury was founded prematurely, for the need for higher education was not as pressing as the need for basic education. The early church turned its energies to those who lacked the basic literacy and, hence, to the establishment of academies.

The Wesleyan tradition in education has endeavored to avoid narrow sectarianism. Cosmopolitan and ecumenical in nature, Methodist institutions have been open to all. At Cokesbury College, the first two professors were a Quaker and a Catholic.

Several generations after the founding of Cokesbury, when the sons and daughters of Methodists began to pursue higher education, the church initiated a renewed effort at establishing colleges and universities. Between 1830 and 1870, many institutions of higher education were founded. The motto of Kingswood School, *In Gloriam Dei Optimi Maximi In Usum Ecclesiae Et Republicae* (To the glory of the most high God in the service of the church and state) reflects the multiple purposes of Methodism in higher education. Like institutions founded by other churches during this period, the purpose of the schools included educating the clergy, providing access to the professions, "civilizing" the frontier and providing Methodist institutions for Methodist young people.

Not surprisingly, states with a substantial church membership had a high concentration of Methodist institutions.

In education, the Wesleyan tradition has demonstrated concern for constituencies whose needs were unmet. Wesleyan College, for example, founded as Georgia Female College, is the oldest college for women in the world. Following the Civil War, education for blacks became an important mission. The Methodist Episcopal Church led in education for blacks as an outgrowth of its close identification with the Emancipation Movement. The Freedman's Aid Society, founded in 1866, became the church's agency which addressed the vocational, educational, and religious need of freed blacks. The continued commitment on the part of Methodists to the education of blacks is demonstrated by the fact that of the 42 church-related, predominantly black senior colleges and universities, 11 are related to The United Methodist Church.

Seminaries were established in the decades following the founding of colleges. Initially, the circuit rider may not have had as much formal education as needed; however, the circuit rider's concerns and interests were symbolized by saddlebags of books. As the church membership itself became better educated, seminaries were established, primarily in the period 1840-1875, to provide an educated clergy.

As time went on, the church evidenced concern about questions of educational quality and about the loss of certain of its institutions. In 1892, a University Senate was formed to develop a rational connectional system and to establish national standards for the expanding educational effort. The Senate preceded by three years the founding of the first national accrediting agency for higher education institutions.

Of approximately 130 institutions related to the church in the 1800s, over 90 are in existence today and are still related to the church. The United Methodist connectional system of higher education is today the largest Protestant denominational system in higher education. Even in the last two decades, five new institutions have been established. One hundred and twenty-two institutions are related to The United Methodist Church —including seven universities, 81 four-year colleges, 19 two-year colleges, two professional schools, and 13 seminaries—located in 40 states. Only two percent of the church's membership live in states without benefit of one or more United Methodist-related institutions. United Methodist institutions represent nine percent of the 1,157 independent universities and colleges (excluding specialized institutions) and include 107 of the 790 church-related colleges and universities.

As these institutions developed, the church did not take a narrowly possessive view of them. Some members believed the church had accomplished its mission when certain institutions fulfilled their proposed missions and closed or were taken over by the state. Today nine state institutions were at one time United Methodist-related.

The United Methodist record is one of considerable accomplishment. Because of the extensiveness of its system, the church can have an impact on society as well as on members of other denominations.

No organization should live in the past, but neither should it deny its history and heritage. The United Methodist Church should be proud of its tradition, history, and heritage in higher education. Had United Methodists not created such a substantial network of institutions of higher education, it would now have to do so for the sake of the Gospel and for the survival of The United Methodist Church.

United Methodist Concern for a Liberally Educated Clergy and Laity

United Methodist education has tried to avoid sectarianism. One of the concerns of the church has been to provide institutions to serve its members and society in providing an educated laity and clergy. The need for educating church leadership was perceived by those participating in the Christmas Conference in 1784. The assembly's action was a bold experiment, especially in view of the fact that Thomas Coke was the only college graduate in attendance. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury knew that the church needed schools if it were to flourish and that each generation had a responsibility to prepare future leaders.

Today, all of the 45 active bishops have attended institutions of higher education related to The United Methodist Church. Further, in electing their bishops, United Methodist folk have elected a substantial number of bishops who have served as teachers or administrative officers in institutions of higher education, demonstrating affirmation of the academy in the life of the church.

But to serve the church is not the only purpose of higher education. Wesley acknowledged the importance of having a trained and informed laity, whether Methodist or not. The fact that many of the early graduates and former students of United Methodist institutions founded some of

the early non-Methodist colleges in this country fulfilled Wesley's intention.

The colleges comprise a network of institutions located throughout the United States. While more Methodist students attend state universities and colleges than Methodist-related institutions, one study of fourteen United Methodist colleges that are quite varied in history, tradition, and mission, revealed that of 20,300 students enrolled in 1974-75, 31% or 6,330 were Methodist.

The education of the laity and clergy has been a central focus of The United Methodist Church. Providing liberally educated persons for service to the church and society has been central to the church's vision—the uniting of knowledge and vital piety.

United Methodist Concern for Value-Centered Inquiry

Not all knowledge is of equal value. One recalls T. S. Eliot's question: "Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge, where is the knowledge we have lost in information?" Public decisions today are made increasingly on utilitarian and technological rationales. But issues related to the environment and the use of world resources involve questions of value as well as technology. Issues such as bioeugenics and the definition of death are often discussed in a context limited by technological or pragmatic terms. Clearly there is a compelling need for value-centered inquiry.

The discussion about a limited-growth society, for example, is really a discussion about values. Obviously the discussion is informed by technological data related to resource development, land use, environmental effects, and economic impact. But the evaluation of the data will reflect value orientations. The discussion should be aired in colleges and universities and, in the process, both the value and technological issues should be clarified.

Just as questions about the character and quality of American life are value questions, so are those questions raised at an institutional level. Colleges should analyze policies and missions in terms of the underlying values. Understandably, some institutions place hign value on the issue of survival without much thought to appropriate means or the consequences of the actions; for example, personnel policies of institutions re-

flect the values of the institution and should be consistent with the professed values of the college or university.

Questions of value often turn on the evaluation and balancing of competing claims to legitimacy, authority, or allegiance. Ethical action requires the confrontation of the facts of a situation with an underlying value set. This is essential for the individual to make choices and be responsible for them. Under the best of circumstances, the learning experience enables the student to integrate questions of value, informed by theological understanding, into choices that are confronted continually.

Faculty members who believe in a purposeful creator who is the source and sustainer of values can bring that perspective to the consideration of values in their teaching. Some of the people who teach religion should entertain the possibility that the religious studies in which they engage point to the truth by which people may live.

All of our activity as rational beings is focused, as the great philosophers suggest, on three questions. What can I know? What ought I know? What may I hope? Similarly, the academy should ask its students: How do you know? and What ought you to do? These questions are central to the value-centered education of the college of the church. General education is too often limited to the question, What can I know?

The compartmentalization and fragmentation that has resulted from departmental isolation within a higher educational institution has contributed to the alleged breach between the world of fact and the world of value. Institutions sponsored by the church are able to address issues of fragmentation and isolation on college campuses.

The colleges of the church provide an important milieu. The United Methodist Church is committed to value-centered inquiry and to action based on belief. Inquiry and action are inseparable. In an age when our technology has exceeded our ability to cope from a theological or value perspective with the choices technology presents, the educational enterprise of the church is needed more than ever.

United Methodist Concern for the Empowerment of the Individual Through Liberal Arts Education

Liberal arts education is concerned with the whole person or the full development of the individual—the freed or liberated person. A liberated

person is freed from ignorance and parochialism—from the limitations of a particular age, upbringing, circumstance. In essence, liberal arts education helps to liberate the individual to understand the continuity in life, to recognize ambiguity and frustration as part of the human dilemma, and to prepare the individual to cope and grow with personal, professional, religious, and family challenges of life.

A college of the church which places a high value on the individual is in a distinct position to deal with tensions and problems facing liberal arts education today. The college of the church makes a great contribution to the extent it is freer from the pressures of status and territorial protection found among the faculty, administrators, and trustees in the state sector. Focused on the individual, colleges of the church can develop the educational reforms needed to maintain the liberal arts with student outcomes being of primary importance.

Newspapers and television commericals are filled with advice offering quick ways to receive an education. Send in the coupon and you achieve instant understanding and financial gain. A college education has the capability of providing the individual with more than a quick ticket to a job. Job needs do require attention, however, especially in view of today's economic situation. Within the liberal arts tradition, colleges of the church can play a significant role in responding to the tensions between vocational and liberal education. Since work is viewed not as degrading but as worthy and as a means to contribute to other persons, colleges of the church can compatibly provide work-related skills and liberal arts education. Thus, colleges related to The United Methodist Church contribute to the acquisition of work-related skills without giving up the liberating aims of liberal arts education and still, hopefully, avoid a crisis of mission.

In the classical world, the few who were educated considered themselves above doing work, preferring to deal with abstractions rather than the immediate. In today's changing society, this dichotomy can be remedied; the practicality of a liberal arts education can be found in providing an individual with versatility. The needs of the job market change so rapidly that deciding on a viable career today may leave the student jobless in the next decade. A liberal arts education allows the student to develop the openness and flexibility of thought to cope with the continually changing job demands encountered throughout life.

There is a debate concerning whether liberal arts education is best con-

ducted in retreat or within an urban setting. There is merit in establishing a controlled environment in which to integrate values, behaviors, and learning, and to clarify personal presuppositions. A church-related college can provide this type of environment to respond to needs of particular students—whether they are exceptionally able or educationally deprived.

Liberal arts colleges are uniquely advantaged in being able to establish not only formal curricula as manifest in catalog statements but also informal curricula derived from the aggregate of campus life. A college of the church can move the questions of value and religious discernment from speculation and analysis to personal application and commitment. The moral, spiritual, and intellectual development of the whole person is nurtured.

The non-church-related college may emphasize cognitive curricula and may be expected to deal with value, philosophic, and religious questions intellectually, objectively, and perhaps skeptically. A college of the church may be expected to deal with the same issues in the context of a belief system in ways more immediate to the learner and more directly related to personal decisions.

United Methodist Commitment to Cultural Pluralism and Educational Diversity

Sustaining the right of individuals to form groups to meet their particular needs has been a major characteristic of the American culture. Pluralism and diversity depend on a culture which recognizes the right of individuals to form associations and groups to meet their particular needs. Part of the American heritage and fabric is the encouragement, maintenance, and fostering of groups to be responsive to their own needs without governmental control or substantial intervention.

A significant characteristic of our society has been the development of a plethora of voluntary associations. De Tocqueville, the sensitive and insightful commentator on American society, recognized the development of private associations—including churches and educational institutions—as a keystone of American culture. Burke noted that the presence of the "little platoons" intervening between the individual and the state were key elements in the maintenance of freedom in this country.

Daniel Webster's arguments and Justice Marshall's decision in the Dartmouth College case were instrumental in upholding the principle that private citizens had the right to establish colleges not subject to state control. Webster eloquently argued for the maintenance of the integrity of the independent institution: "It will be a dangerous, a most dangerous experiment, to hold these institutions subject to the rise and fall of popular parties, and the fluctuations of political opinions." The decision of the Marshall court in favor of Webster's arguments gave legal protection to voluntary private groups to establish colleges to serve their particular purposes and for those colleges not to be subject to state control.

Private philanthropy is based on the premise that individuals should be left free to choose to support organizations in which they are interested, thereby supporting and maintaining our pluralistic society. A noted jurist suggested, "It is the very possibility of doing something different than government can do, of creating an institution free to make choices government cannot"; that is the essence of our historical recognition through public policy of the role of private philanthrophy in fostering pluralism.

Our country's commitment to pluralism was recognized by the constitutional framers who assured future generations that education would be decentralized. The placement of education primarily in the hands of the states fosters a heterogeneity that contributes to the permanency of the union.

Independent colleges and universities under private control are among the most visible fruits of a pluralistic society. The independent sector can be seen as an aggregate of the distinctive statements of the different groups within the American culture. An independent academic estate is critical to the enhancement of America's diverse cultures and the preservation of personal and group freedom. Such an estate is free to raise the prophetic voice which society so sorely needs.

The United Methodist Church, for example, supported colleges and schools for particular ethnic groups when it was not popular to do so. When the education of Southern blacks was not high on the secular agenda, United Methodists established and supported predominantly black colleges. They built colleges for academic excellence and helped other colleges become better; they built colleges for service which have sustained that role.

Independent institutions provide the much needed diversity in education

that allows students a wide range of choice of institutions. One educational critic notes that the decline of diversity is primarily a product of the states having become the major sponsors of education in this country with consequent homogenization. Alaska Methodist University, for example, is the only four-year independent institution in the State of Alaska. A strong independent sector can counter the tendency within the state sector toward homogeneity in purpose and program and counter the pressures toward merely utilitarian objectives. By providing an alternative to a state controlled monopoly of higher education, the independent sector can protect freedom of expression from occasional political abuse not only on its own campuses, but on those of state institutions as well.

Independent colleges contribute to diversity by their ability to select students, faculty, and trustees in keeping with their stated and functional purposes and to direct their institutions toward particular purposes, social needs, or constituencies. Independent institutions, less subject to political shifts in areas such as funding, can maintain their integrity which strengthens academic freedom for all higher education.

The independent sector of higher education supports institutions that excel in varying areas. The United Methodist Church assesses its colleges, not only on the basis of high levels of academic excellence as judged against national and regional standards, but also on the basis of how much a particular college may offer a particular student. The church's colleges identify excellence as contributing to the development of each individual's human potential.

United Methodists have a heritage of pluralism within the church and have manifested great tolerance for differing beliefs. The church itself is plural in nature and facilitates and encourages individuals and groups of all persuasions to join the reflection upon the nature of God. United Methodists have established, adopted, sustained, and supported hundreds of educational institutions in the United States that were and are quite diverse in terms of people served and the nature of the service.

The United Methodist Church's historic and current commitment to the enhancement of cultural pluralism and the preservation of freedom depend on the maintenance of significant social institutions not under the control of the state. In this regard, the continual support and sponsorship of institutions of higher education remain an unfilled agenda. Even in the face of the declining scope for privateness, including the inde-

pendent sector of higher education, The United Methodist Church should continue to preserve the independent sector which is essential to the diversity in higher education, the pluralism so necessary to freedom, and the enhancement of the quality of higher education. For the sake of society as a whole, The United Methodist Church must perpetuate an academic estate functionally independent of the state.

Summary

The United Methodist Church is in higher education because it is the nature of the church to express itself in the intellectual love of God. The Wesleyan tradition and heritage has supported the uniting of knowledge and vital piety from its very beginning which has required the founding, establishing, and supporting of institutions of higher education whose purpose is to serve the church and society and to educate laity and clergy.

Central to the church is a commitment to value-centered inquiry, best manifested in colleges of the church, and to the liberal arts tradition which fosters the empowerment of the individual.

Part of the American tradition and culture has been a commitment to the maintenance of a pluralistic society. The independent sector of higher education is one of the significant groups in the society and provides a major means for the maintenance of a pluralistic culture. Therefore, United Methodists persist in sponsoring and maintaining a significant system of higher education not totally dependent upon the state.

By maintaining an independent or privately sponsored sector of higher education, United Methodists may foster a prophetic role by helping particular regional, social, or ethnic groups develop educational programs and institutions for their own people that both strengthen group or cultural identity and also empower individuals of such groups to make their way in the larger society.

For all of these reasons, The United Methodist Church should continue and strengthen its commitment to its mission in institutional higher education.

Prior to drafting the preceding statement of purpose, the staff of the National Commission prepared several position papers describing specific aspects of the total rationale. These were the basis of initial Commission discussion, and together form the foundation for the synthesis statement ultimately adopted. Here the several arguments are developed more fully than in the preceding statement. It should be emphasized that although the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education has received and utilized these papers, it is the staff and not the Commission membership which must bear responsibility for their content, as they have not been adopted or otherwise approved by the National Commission membership.

T. Michael Elliott
Kent M. Weeks
Renée G. Loeffler
Diane Dillard

PART TWO

A Theological Basis for Higher Education

The recollection that theology was once viewed as the "queen of the sciences" is a reminder of a time when all learning had a theistic framework and professions in the west were grounded in the Judeo-Christian perspective. From this "theonomous" perspective, institutions of higher learning found their reasons for being. That unity was broken and universities for many centuries now have been shaped by a variety of strategies and world-views.

The problem of stating a theological rationale for higher education is, therefore, a complex one. Not only has the institution of the university itself changed, but ways of thinking about God have been so profoundly altered that even institutions with close historic ties with the church, once more fully expressive of a religious self-consciousness, have been cut off from the theologies that sparked their origins. These institutions have been altered by struggles for freedom of inquiry from inferior theologies such as repressive orthodoxy or clerical interference. They have been fragmented by competing world-views and impacted by state agenda in ways that have led to a loss of coherence in stated purpose.

Most institutions of higher learning in America were founded by churches whose strategies included the impulse to produce a learned clergy, to provide access to professions, to "civilize" the frontier, and to maintain ethnic or sectarian interests. Even in these truncated forms, far removed from the classical university thought of as a theological community, the passion for learning as a responsibility of the church persisted and the churches properly considered themselves to be fulfilling a mission in higher education. That passion, however, has been severely tested by the expansion of higher education in our time and the increasing difficulty in justifying the maintenance of institutions as a *necessary* expression of church policy and belief.

The fragmentation of the enterprise of higher education itself further separated the church from the schools because of the loss of a sense of unity in the purpose of the enterprise. Clark Kerr's suggestion that the

---

This paper was prepared for the National Commission staff by Dr. F. Thomas Trotter, General Secretary of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church.

evolution of the university in the west was from university to *multi*versity is illustrative. Robert Hutchins' observation that the only thing uniting the elements of a modern university is the central heating system is a wry comment on the diversity of the institution. The liberal arts, buffeted by doubts and attacks of those for whom learning is defined only in utilitarian terms, remain the last remnant of what was long held in the west to be the central purpose of learning. The classical *trivium* of medieval learning, the first curriculum of liberal arts, has become "trivia" and is supported in desultory ways even in colleges closely related to religious traditions.

The heady expansion of higher education in the 1950s and 1960s accelerated the fragmentation. Student attacks on the university, however deplorable in terms of strategies or bad manners, had the implicit power of prophetic protest against institutions whose rhetoric and costuming still recalled the humane and liberal intentions of education, but whose life had given way to distracted and even inhumane practices and inattention to the issues of wisdom and criticism. Without a center, the institution flew apart into a vast and complicated organism scarcely conscious of a unified purpose other than efforts at improvised strategies for survival.

Church-related institutions in this period became "isomorphic"—indistinguishable from the general and public institution. In point of fact, a liberal arts college related to church history and intention became but a smaller version of the multiversity. The principal reasons for commending these institutions became the virtue of "smallness." In fact, they had assumed the same problems of diffusion and lack of coherence as their larger counterparts. What "theological" impact in them was reduced to a lingering piety or parietal insistence that reflected at best only the margins of a coherent theological foundation. Thus the need for careful exploration of the matter is essential to any new statement of the ultimate utility of this enterprise in the economy of the church.

The "purpose" of these schools is deeply and inextricably related to reflection on the "purpose" of God. That is the heart of the "theological" rationale for church institutions. Therefore the clarification of the future of these schools is a theological task from the point of view of the church structures.

Theology may be defined as reflecting upon the nature of God and speaking about God in intelligent and faithful ways. In the Judeo-Christian

tradition of the west, the fundamental theological assertion is the idea of "creation." That, in short, is the article of belief in a good and purposeful creator who is the source and sustainer of values. God has created the world to be the ecology in which persons would so live that they would worship and "enjoy" the creator forever. Thus, fundamental to all theistic statements are the ideas of joy, responsibility, care for the world, love of neighbor, and a lively sense of the wholeness (holiness) of all things. This story obviously is a faithful metaphor, growing out of the consciousness of purpose and elaborated by the "pre-scientific" story tellers of Israel. "Creation out of nothing" (*creatio ex nihilo*) became the article of trust expressive of the empirical confidence of Israel. (Later, when St. Augustine was asked what God was doing before creating the world, he wryly remarked, "He was making hell for people who ask that question.") The biblical language of the creation notion contains a necessary and powerful element in religious tradition. So the Jewish *Shema Yisroel*, "There is one God," is another expression of this unitary element. Coherence and confidence are the functional and vital deductions from this *mono*-theism.

The story is elaborated by the teaching of the "Fall." This is the symbol of the empirical observation that the world appears to have been seriously deflected from the purposes of intentionality of the creator. The purpose of God has become obscured. Faith in those intentions is now tested by the alienation of humanity from God. Joy is replaced by despair, responsibility by self-centeredness, care by distraction, love by hate, and wholeness by fragmentation. The wisdom literature of Israel is the argument with God over this pathetic state of the world. Exodus, Covenant, Exile become the literary and historical "explanations" and arguments for restoration of the good intention of God's plan for creation.

The content of Christian "revelation" is the assertion that creation is set in the direction of wholeness by the person of Jesus of Nazareth. His teaching is continuous with the traditions of Israel, especially in the prophetic accent. His crucifixion is the intersection of the best intentions of God with the worst intentions of humanity. The cross is the mid-point in the history of the argument with God. The Resurrection is the moment of assurance that the purposes of God are intact. The attention of the Christian movement on the person of Jesus as the Christ is, therefore, indispensable to understanding the world. The theology of the New Testament is the statement of the church's conviction that the good creation, temporarily bent by human sin, is restored by the Christ-event and humanity's obedient trust in that event. Rationalistic critics, religious and

nonreligious, may refute the extravagant claims of this assertion, but the centrality of the Christ-event and hope in the promised fulfillment of the intention of God through creation is the norm of all Christian ethical and institutional existence.

In this tradition, learning becomes ideally an act of worship and joy. It becomes a gesture of human response to a knowable and good world. Persistent in the scriptural tradition are themes such as "knowing," "seeing," "learning," in the context of which "believing," "acting," and "loving" are counterpoint. Charles Wesley's Kingswood School hymn seeks, in the midst of the rationalism of the 18th century, to celebrate the "reuniting" of the elements so long separated: knowledge, learning, and truth, with vital piety, holiness, and love. (*The Book of Hymns*, 344) This coherence, however, is always tenuous in the tradition. In Israel, the prophetic tradition was a call to coherence in faith. Its iconoclasm remains a feature of modern academic ideology although it may celebrate its theistic roots in truncated ways. Prophetism sought to recall Israel from the idolatrous forms of knowledge and to urge the return to attention to the wisdom of Israel. The wisdom tradition (e.g., the Psalms) illustrates this accent. But there is another movement that describes the bending of knowledge to various forms of technological utility (e.g., the Solomonic tradition and the tradition of the Kings). In the New Testament, the same struggle continues but now expressed in the Greek setting and seen in the essentially Socratic-existential style of knowledge over against the sophistic uses of knowledge. What is debated is the problem of the nature of knowledge and the purpose of learning over against the uses of knowledge and the methods of learning. One recalls T. S. Eliot's question to our century: "Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge, where is the knowledge we have lost in information?"

The problem with this immense tradition from the Christian point of view today is that we have inherited the tradition of learning as utilitarian but have lost the tradition of learning as leading to "wisdom" in the theological sense. We have managed to survive relatively intact as free from restraints in learning (academic freedom) but as a reflex of a methodological premise rather than a gesture of liberation from all limitations within the freedom of God. The gift of freedom makes humanity free in Christ. Therefore, no cosmology, no world view, no demons, no narrow self-interest, no departmental politics, no nationalism, no taboo can separate persons from the joy of knowing. Higher education is a joyless affair for most in our time. For the Christian it ought to be the highest joy because it is an act of the acknowledgement of the freedom of persons to be what God intends them to be.

The precedence of faith (a conviction in the reality of a just and loving God and a good world) over understanding or reason was affirmed by St. Augustine. But Anselm's famous thesis *fides quaerens intellectum* (faith in search of understanding) remains the classical expression of this thesis. For post-medieval time, the contrary, *intellego ut credam* (understanding seeking belief), tended to reverse the priorities and succeeded in providing an autonomy of knowledge. The results for scientific study were astonishing, but have led in these later days to indifference and specialized learning and the resignation of the scientist and the moralist for responsibility for coherence outside the "field." Autonomous humanity in this sense is not only alienated from the ontology which provides coherence but also suffers from isolation from other fields of learning as well. The current interest in "interdisciplinary" studies is an attempt to restore if not overcome the fractures in academic isolation. A persistent theme of faculties is the assumption that professors teach their "areas" but students are expected to "integrate."

The continuity between the Old Testament and the New Testament in the quest for an ontology of learning may be illustrated variously. Jesus is spoken of as "the Truth." "Know the Truth and the Truth will make you free." Truth is not, as the linguistic philosophers (latter day sophists) would have us believe, correct statement or fact. Truth is confidence in the personalistic theism of the New Testament. "If you have seen me, you have seen the Father." In the story of Jesus in his hometown synagogue, we see a striking instance of this coherence between the claims made for Jesus and the uses of knowledge. (Luke 4:17-21) Jesus reveals the ontology of faith, earlier expressed by Isaiah, and the issues are liberation, justice, restoration of sight, healing—in short, the gifts of freedom.

Pauline insistence upon the priority of faith in the freedom of man to be alive in the world later becomes the basis for renewal in the Reformation period and the Wesleyan revival, both of which opened new surges of learning and responsibility for care of the world.

This tradition of the story of God's way with humanity haunts our world but only occasionally informs it. Our passion for the relativity of values and history and belief, while commendable from the point of view of guarding tolerance, is ultimately debilitating for religious institutions. The crisis in religious education is but a manifestation of a far vaster malaise in the church itself. Even the theological seminary, the "last" university, has become conditioned by heteronomous and distracted models. Specialities there have imitated other professions and have often

lost the special claim upon their existence, namely the concentration upon the uniqueness of a coherent vision and hope in a world made new, not by doing good abstractly, but by living in the lively sense of the freedom laid open in the good news of Jesus the Christ. Technique has triumphed in the church and seminary and we are on the way to more erosion of faith in the ultimate goodness of God as a precondition of Christian self-understanding.

In Elie Wiesel's touching Hassidic tales, a certain Rabbi went to a place in the forest, lit a fire, said a prayer, and told the story. His students successively lost the place in the forest, failed to light the fire, forgot the prayer, and finally could only tell the story. We, unlike the Hassidim, have most of the ritual intact but we are in danger of forgetting the story. Yet the story haunts us and bursts out of memory with great power as in the black community in the recent past. Martin Luther King empowered a whole generation through recollection of Exodus and Exile. These events always come to the church as a great surprise.

It is certainly clear that the church cannot expect nor should even suggest that great universities become targets for evangelical strategies. Such a position would fly in the face of the facts of the matter. The university, with its multiplex of systems, world-views, and technological strategies, must be viewed by the church from a different theological perspective. It has been given to the world and is profoundly a pluralistic organism. But its right to exist, its devotion to truth, its participation in the untrammeled search for understanding are properly supported by the church and should be empowered appropriately by the church. There can be no discontinuity between this vision and the Christian theological confidence in the intentionality of God. Through appropriate professional schools, such as divinity, the secularized university stands as a microcosm of the general society in its scientific thrust. Therefore "presence" in the university is not optional, but required of the church. But governance in inappropriate ways, tendentious posturing, and petulance are not only improper from the point of view of theology but are ultimately blasphemous. Participation in the university itself, the lively exchange of positions, the care for the community, the prophetic criticism that requires engagement, and the participation in public policy decisions appropriate to the survival of the university are required by the theology of the church. The "intellectual love of God" requires love on the part of the church for all intellectual work and requires both support and prophetic criticism. (There is considerable evidence that so-called "secular" universities through various programs have maintained programs of religious impact often without and in spite of church interest.)

The church-related college presents another possibility for theological reflection and life. More frequently the college is more closely related to the church and its judicatories, even in governance. Therefore the options available for experimentation and criticism are more visible.

If the church is to take seriously its intellectual work, then some institutional form of this work must be shaped in this generation. A study of college catalogs reveals that most institutions have only tenuous understanding of their theological purposes. These are expressed mostly in college mottoes, seldom in statements of purpose, and almost never in catalog descriptions of program or curriculum. If faith is the precondition of knowledge and joy and utility, then what models of institutional life or curricular development may properly be tested to provide such a context? In what ways can intentionality be developed in institutions that have leaned most heavily in the past on parietal definitions of church-connectedness? What are the risks of evangelism in a sophisticated environment? Can an institution survive without test oaths or other "guards" against sectarianism? Can an institution provide a frank context of Judeo-Christian apologetic at all in time of compliance? Should we risk a model or two? The statement of the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education will provide the basis for institutions and church agencies to begin to clarify these matters.

Our problem is complicated by virtue of the fact that we are not dealing with a "higher education" issue alone. The "conversion" of the church itself is a significant part of this problem. Does the church value intellectual life sufficiently to assume continuing and expanded responsibility here? Has the theological self-understanding of the church itself succumbed to utilitarian strategies? Is the church presently able to sense the pressure of the prophetic/Socratic tradition over against the Solomonic/sophistic tradition?

If we argue only on utilitarian lines, then the argument for continued and expanded church interest in higher education is weak. But if we argue on faithful theological premises, from the biblical story, the New Testament sense of liberation in the Gospel, and the uses of the intellect as an act of thanksgiving and praise, then some more profound necessities will be asserted for the church's life in higher education.

Institutions of Higher Education and The United Methodist Church: A Unique Tradition

The United Methodist Church has a long, rich tradition in American higher education. It is estimated that since Cokesbury College, Methodism has had connections in one way or another with at least one thousand schools in America.[1]

Education for All

The United Methodist Church's concern for the education of all persons, regardless of ethnic, economic, or social background is manifested through its relationship with institutions having different purposes and constituencies. In the earliest days, this concern was expressed through the establishment of primary and secondary schools. The initial concern was basic literacy. Later, as the level of literacy rose, higher education became the major concern.

Wesley directly influenced the church's involvement in education. He became involved in educational matters when there was no significant education for the children of the working class except as pre-apprenticeship training. Educational opportunities for women were also not generally available. Wesley was disappointed with tax-supported education of his day, finding it "godless" and "harsh."[2] For Wesley, religion and education went hand in hand:

> . . . Since he believed that, though God is the only physician of souls, man might assist in the cure, and that the assistance could only be effectively rendered by education, we can see that in John Wesley's mind the scope of education was universal, embracing both the poor and the rich, and that

[1] Nolan B. Harmon, ed., *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), I, 749. The often-quoted figure of 1000 institutions includes universities, colleges, academies, and secondary and elementary schools founded and owned by the church as well as privately owned institutions conducted in the interest of the church. The National Commission of United Methodist Higher Education will soon publish a history of institutions that will detail this involvement in education.

[2] Alfred H. Body, *John Wesley and Education* (London: The Epworth Press, 1936), p. 33.

for him the stratification of society, each with its different need in education, no longer existed.[3]

John Wesley's concern for the education of "all" was explicitly incorporated into the American Methodist tradition. In 1791 Bishop Asbury wrote a letter to Methodists reminding them of their obligation to erect a school in the vicinity of every church, ". . . to give the key of knowledge in a general way, to your children, and those of the poor in the vicinity of your small towns and villages." [4]

The Civil War had a special impact on Methodist involvement in primary education. After the war, the southern states had limited resources for the rebuilding of their educational systems. The Methodist Episcopal Church responded to the need by developing a program of secondary education. The General Conference encouraged the establishment of secondary schools in every presiding elder's district.[5] By 1886, 225 educational institutions had been founded, controlled, owned, or directed in the interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In addition, another 58 educational institutions were founded by private individuals but conducted in the interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church.[6] Many attained a standard of excellence which contemporary tax-supported secondary schools never achieved.

The Methodists were among the first to feel that a liberal education was necessary for the poor as well as the rich, the black as well as the white, the woman as well as the man. The church's contribution to the education of the underprivileged, of blacks, and of women is extraordinary. As a result of its close identification with the emancipation movement, the Methodist Episcopal Church was a leader in the education of blacks after the Civil War. The Freedman's Aid Society, founded in 1866, became the church agency which addressed the vocational, educational, and religious needs of freed blacks. This commitment on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church to the education of blacks continues today through 12 predominantly black colleges and the programs of many other United Methodist-related institutions. Meharry College has graduated almost 50% of the black physicians and dentists now practicing in this country, and Gammon Theological Seminary has been foremost in the theological

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

[4] Letters, to the Brethren in the United Societies, September 16, 1791, as quoted in *The History of American Methodism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1964), I, 548.

[5] *The Encyclopedia of World Methodism, loc. cit.*

[6] A. W. Cummings, *Early Schools of Methodism* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1886), pp. 426-427.

education of blacks. Wesleyan College, a United Methodist institution founded as Georgia Female College in 1836, was the first American institution to offer women a liberal collegiate education and is the oldest college for women in the world.[7] Other institutions were specifically intended to provide for the education of the children of poor people, including Spartanburg Methodist College in South Carolina.

Education of Ministers

The need for well-trained, learned clergy, the educational needs of an increasingly affluent church membership, and interdenominational competition were factors which influenced Methodist involvement in higher education. As the frontier lands became increasingly settled and as schools developed, the populace became increasingly literate. The Methodist Episcopal Church of the 18th century had recruited its membership largely from the less privileged classes. The Methodist church of the 19th century, however, saw the expansion of both wealth and education among its membership. Finding it was behind the times, the church recognized its need for a more educated clergy. Methodism competed with other denominations for both members and image.

> The ranks of our ministry were often impoverished by young men of piety and promise going out among others to seek literary advantages which we could not give them, and finally connecting themselves with other ecclesiastical bodies.[8]

Thus, even while some church leaders continued to oppose the notion of a "man-made ministry," pressure from the pioneer membership forced the creation of the first school for ministers at Newmarket, New Hampshire, in 1843. This institution later moved to Boston where it became the School of Theology of Boston University.[9] Currently 13 seminaries and schools of theology are affiliated with and supported by The United Methodist Church and carry the church's responsibility for theological education.

---

[7] *The History of American Methodism*, op. cit., I, 560.

[8] Methodist Magazine, July, 1839, p. 272, as quoted in *The History of American Methodism*, op. cit., I, 551.

[9] John O. Gross, *The Beginnings of American Methodism* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1961), pp. 118-119.

Higher Education with a Religious Dimension

In the absence of Methodist institutions of higher education, Methodist youth wishing to pursue their education were forced to go to institutions of other denominations. In the process, they often abandoned Methodism and joined the church that sponsored their college or university.[10]

This trend was a source of great concern to many and was viewed as a practical reason for the founding of colleges. Moreover, the role of education in deepening and maturing conversion had been set forth by Wesley. Knowledge was viewed as empowering to Christian individuals in such a way as to benefit the individual, the church, and society.[11]

From the outset the church's involvement in education was both broad-minded and inclusive.[12] *In Gloriam Dei Optimi Maximi In Usum Ecclesiae Et Republicae:* "To the glory of the most high God in the service of the church and state." This Latin statement, chosen by Wesley as the motto of Kingswood School, embraces the United Methodist ministry in higher education, a ministry whose institutions "have given the search for knowledge full freedom in a Christian but nonsectarian atmosphere." [13]

The essence of the Methodist tradition is that education is a means to serve. This tradition obliges the United Methodists of today to call upon the vision of faith and the insights of human knowledge to serve the educational needs of contemporary society. The challenge is to adapt to new needs, even though change may be difficult for entrenched institutions.

The Tradition Manifested

No statistics on the number and variety of colleges and their constituencies tell the story of United Methodism in higher education better than the life and work of David Camak, the founder of what is now Spartanburg Methodist College. Born on a South Carolina cotton farm, he witnessed as a youth the great farm-to-town movement at the turn of the century. He saw poor and ill-educated cotton farmers moving to mill towns for work. Their children often went to work in the mills as early as ten years of age. Seeing the pathetic trap of many of these people—

---

10 *The History of American Methodism, loc. cit.*
11 Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
12 *The History of American Methodism, op. cit.*, I, 552-553.
13 Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

caught between their work circumstance and the limitations of their knowledge and understanding—he dreamed of providing an opportunity of liberal education for these people while they worked. As a poor circuit riding Methodist minister, he spoke and wrote about his idea for a long time before it was accepted. He walked in a "wilderness" without sympathetic or supportive audiences.

Once during his wilderness sojourn, he was offered a large church in Arkansas at two and one half times his salary in South Carolina. Eventually, he was asked to name his own salary for the post. He refused the appointment. Despite the lack of support for his dream for the mill people of the Piedmont, he committed himself to it. He recalled this lonely time and the temptation of the Arkansas offer in the following words:

> In Nashville, I had heard the pastor of an institutional church in Chicago tell the thrilling story of his uplift work. I had previously read everything I could get on Jane Addams and Hull House. And the more I heard or read, the more my heart called for a part in something of the kind. Had I not known the needs of the cotton mill people, the high quality of their racial heritage, and the great importance of their proper integration into the social order of the South—and had I not continued to feel that this was my God-given task—I most surely would have gone to Arkansas.[14]

Colleges in and out of Methodism have arisen from such commitments. Camak, deeply identified with his people, persisted in following his dream despite long years of denial of that dream by others and tempting diversions. Not only did he succeed in establishing an educational institution for cotton mill folk for his time, but he also initiated cooperative education long before it was considered by others.

United Methodists help preserve a social and economic climate that helps individuals and groups realize dreams for which they are willing to sacrifice. Camak identified specific needs of a specific people. He related those needs to transcendent values and commitments. He committed his all to their realization and finally lost himself in his cause.

The Tradition Today

The major themes of the United Methodist tradition in higher education might be summarized as:

---

[14] David English Camak, *Human Coal From Southern Hills* (Nashville: Parthenon Press, 1960), p. 82.

Education should be available to all people regardless of social standing, ethnic identity, or gender.

Education should appropriately relate faith and reason.

Education should help individuals make full use of their capabilities and experience for service. Therefore, liberal and classical learning is critical along with professional and vocational training, and one is not subservient to the other.

Education should aim at high standards of student achievement based on deep concern for what is best for the person.

Individuals' best instincts should be promoted through humane teaching and campus life.

Educational efforts should be re-evaluated periodically in light of contemporary needs.

The United Methodist tradition now faces a new frontier. In terms of quality of life, humane concern for other persons, standards of justice and personal morality, the tradition faces new challenges in contemporary society. The new problems are difficult and require new kinds of solutions, but the tradition is not outdated.

The new frontier is more subtle than the old, its challenges not always as apparent as the abuse of child labor or the slums of 18th century London. Faithfulness to the educational tradition of United Methodists through institutions of education may confirm old principles but take new forms. A change to a new form is not asserted to be necessary for every institution. For some the revitalization of traditional missions and forms will effectively meet the new challenges.

Diversity has always characterized the involvement of United Methodists in higher education. That diversity will continue to serve if each component of the system is true to the tradition of United Methodist higher education and provides sound educational offerings relevant to the needs of contemporary society. The United Methodist Church "through the years has been the enemy of ignorance, prejudice, and complacency." [15] It must continue to be so.

[15] Gross, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

Liberal Arts Education in Colleges of the Church

Introduction

Liberal arts education must be discussed in the context of contemporary American culture and from the standpoint of Christian concern. Liberal arts education is a contextual idea or hope, a collection of unvarying concepts. It is an effort of sensitive people to free themselves from the influences that keep them from becoming all that they might. Both the needs of American society and, particularly, the interests and responsibilities of The United Methodist Church in higher education require careful consideration of the basic issues of liberal arts education.

The following theses are proposed as the essence of the argument supporting the assertion that the perpetuation of true liberal arts education is one primary reason for continued involvement of The United Methodist Church in higher education:

- The United Methodist Church strives to manifest its all-encompassing concern for individual persons.
- One manifestation of such concern is support of higher education aimed at helping individuals make full use of themselves in service to their people or given community, to the greater society, and, hence, to themselves.
- Providing opportunities for a liberal arts education, constantly reinterpreted in the light of the changing times, is a primary way in which The United Methodist Church can help persons to develop their full potential.
- The fulfillment of the mission of a college of the church requires that concern for students be paramount and be given precedence over the interests of faculty, administrators, or others.
- A college's potential for service is increased by a clear statement of its mission. The curricula, means of instruction, and campus environment should be systematically evaluated in terms of their effectiveness in serving stated institutional purposes and goals. When ineffective in serving the institution's mission, they should be changed.

- Explicit statements of objectives and ways to determine their realization will help liberal arts colleges and their sponsors reestablish connections in ways favorable to both. Great rewards wait for faculties, administrators, and trustees who relentlessly discipline curricula, budgets, and campus regulations in order to achieve what is best for the student.

Four Dilemmas of Liberal Arts Education

Among the many tensions or dilemmas confronting liberal education are four that seem to be of major concern at this time and to which church-related higher education can make particular contributions.

Vocational versus Liberal Arts Education

Is higher education as preparation for work a prostitution of educational ideals or acceptance of the responsibility to serve? Is the distinction between learning for learning's sake and vocationalism a false issue and one without historic meaning? Have there ever been a significant number of people enrolled in colleges and universities who were there to learn for learning's sake—not intent on using their learning directly in their livelihoods or not concerned for the practicality of the things taught?

It is unlikely that any education has ever been pursued by many people for very long in history without some significant vocational emphasis. Certainly the curricula of the medieval universities were vocational or professional in that they were designed to prepare persons, for example, for the priesthood, law, and medicine. Much of English collegiate education was nonspecific in terms of skills, either administrative or technical, yet it was directly aimed at preparing people to serve in high positions of government, education, and business. The hope was to develop broad intellectual and personal skills as a basis for coping with a variety of issues in different professional endeavors.

The earlier colonial colleges were explicitly intended to prepare persons for careers as magistrates and ministers. As Dresch points out, the stronger, more distinguished universities and colleges in America have consistently admitted highly able students who are relatively clear about their professional and vocational destinations.[1] Such institutions per-

[1] Stephen P. Dresch, "Legal Rights and the Rites of Passage: Experience, Education, and the Obsolescence of Adolescence." Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, December, 1973.

sisted through the late 1950s and 1960s in the training of such people, while "lesser" institutions were developing curricula and courses designed as ends within themselves and rationalized as general or cultural education. It is Dresch's prediction that the stronger institutions will survive the crises anticipated in the 1980s, whereas those that adopted curricula of less direct relationship to work will not. Most educators, as well as a large proportion of the public, would not count training focused totally on job entry skills as a worthy goal of colleges and universities. Nevertheless, educators should recognize that most persons will have to be able to do certain tasks in specific and orderly ways. Education primarily designed for the broadest possible philosophic, social, and aesthetic study can easily slip into producing dilettantes. It may easily leave graduates without the skills and knowledge for a beginning job and little inclination to serve. A college with a Christian orientation has a particular contribution to make toward the concept of work. The Christian faith, in keeping with the Hebrew tradition, is not condescending to the physical and work. Christians view work as worthy and not degrading—a means to contribute to those around them. Thus, church-related colleges can contribute to the acquisition of work-related skills without giving up the liberating aims of liberal arts education.

Retreat versus Involvement

To be relevant, must education be directly induced from the hustle of the market place and the corridors of power? To be substantive, must education be closeted in retreat? Ancient students met in open air forums and under trees. In the medieval world, students congregated in cities and lived together in student tenements. In America, many colleges were located away from cities because they were often founded by people of strong religious and moral fervor who devoutly believed higher education was a spiritual uplift as well as an intellectual exercise which would not be facilitated by constant exposure to city life. The isolated location of other institutions resulted not from design but from problems of communication and travel.

Today many large university and college complexes are located in the midst of cities without campus residences. They serve a more diversified clientele than they did in the past. The growth of urban universities reflects the increasing numbers of people who need to combine work with education. They cannot afford to spend an extended amount of time away from work for purposes of education. Keeping abreast in a technological society also seems to necessitate continuing education. When there was a frontier, one could improve his lot by moving to a more open,

less established area. Now, in a meritocracy, one moves up by becoming more competent.

Students can acquire a great deal of information and skill without being in residence at a college. Centers of learning originally developed because people could come to them more easily than the information could be distributed to dispersed students. Today, however, the practice of giving academic credit only for campus-based learning is not tenable. If, in practice, the purpose of a college is actually and primarily information acquisition and skill development, the retreat arrangement can hardly be justified. With contemporary means of communications, scholars do not have to cluster as the only means of sharing their scholarly insights.

In contrast, the retreat enclave is highly congruent with the historic rationale of liberal arts education. In fact, the English college with its strong emphasis on learning in community and the development of the whole person has strongly influenced American liberal arts colleges. Dialectical capabilities are honed and attitudes and values dealt with and clarified best, it is asserted, through some type of enclave. The unique value of retreat lies in facilitating a serious effort to integrate values, behaviors, and learning along with clarification and re-examination of personal presuppositions. This remains a unique purpose which may be served by small, church-related colleges if sufficient numbers of persons desire such experiences.

A church-related college will try to provide education in the most meaningful way possible given its particular mission and the needs of its particular students. Again, its faculty and curricula will be servants of greater ends. Among the United Methodist-related colleges are many designed for education in retreat. In some cases, they may be used to effect high levels of intellectual achievement and value integration with very able students. In other instances, they may effectively educate students from very poor educational backgrounds. In this case, they may use the advantages of relatively complete environmental control to provide a milieu that significantly compensates for earlier deprivations. Achieving such a goal may require rigorous expectations and demanding regimens of conduct. If so, they are designed to help the student become as capable and strong as he or she can.

Outcome versus Process

A continuing dilemma in education is whether education should be defined in terms of outcome attainments or common input processes. In

liberal arts education, a great tradition lies behind requiring students to be exposed to a common curriculum over a defined period of time. Its essential rationale is to expose good minds to thoughtful people and great scholarly and creative works for the sake of effecting assumed, but unpredetermined, outcomes. In this form, liberal arts education seeks to confront students with the works of literature, philosophy, science, mathematics, and religion which have stood the test of time and to help them integrate those thoughts for their own time. Student motivation and ability are assumed to be generally high. Such education is the combining of good students, good teachers, and proven works of scholarship and research. Its outcome is expected to be good but not entirely predictable.

The common time and exposure approach to curriculum is more workable with a relatively elitist educational program. This method presents one common hurdle for each student, often not adjusting to individual differences or interest. When used in an almost open-admission college, such an approach tends more to expose the differences among students than to move them to some common, minimal proficiencies. This result follows directly from the failure to adjust means and time of instruction to individual student needs.

An alternative emphasis is the attainment of defined intellectual skills and some common core of knowledge without great regard for the time and means of instruction. In the highest and best sense, such skills and knowledge are not necessarily reducible to atomistic behavioral statements. However, possession of such competencies can be observed by other educated people and, if not directly measured, at least appraised with some degree of reliable consensus. The success of this approach requires that the means and time of instruction vary with the learning style and preferences of the student. The assurance of quality is in the the assessment of performance or outcome—not in the rigor of the process or the commonality of time, materials, and instruction. This approach better serves an educational system where assumptions of high motivation and ability cannot be made.

In practice, most educational ventures combine the two positions outlined above. Nevertheless, the American academic credit system does emphasize common time, if not common exposures, because the primary unit of educational attainment remains the credit hour. With the wide acceptance of the elective system and the absence of common proficiency exams or comprehensive senior examinations, quality control in Amer-

ican higher education depends primarily on common time spent exposed to educational processes, trusting the individual teacher of the course or even the section to grade fairly, validly, and reliably.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to have mass, egalitarian higher education yet maintain reasonable standards of quality given an emphasis on common time and means of instruction and relative grading standards. This difficulty no doubt contributes to the current phenomenon of "grade inflation." A way to deal with this dilemma is to emphasize common, minimal performance achievements and allow the means and time of instruction to vary.

It is easy rhetoric but hard practice to make the means and time of instruction serve the purposes of the college. It is also difficult to judge the effectiveness of the means in accomplishing the purposes. It is hard because faculties, administrators, and trustees will have to see themselves as means not ends. Courses may need to be eliminated or drastically changed if they are judged by the effect they have on students' proficiencies. Administrative staffing patterns as well as projects of trustees and donors would all have to submit to the test of whether they demonstrably affect the intentions of the college in terms of student accomplishment. With such a model, those of Christian persuasion in a college have a particular contribution to make. The press for status and territorial protection that can so effectively discourage reform should be less among faculty, administrators, and trustees in a college of a church. Hence, it ought to be possible in church-related colleges committed to Christian service to effect reforms that are in the best interests of students.

Formal versus Informal Curricula

Liberal arts colleges are conceived as having two curricula. One is the formal curriculum as set forth in the catalog. The informal curriculum is the aggregate of campus life. Liberal arts education is not perceived to be solely the sum of the cognitive and psychomotor accomplishment of students. Historically, it has also been believed and hoped to be the product of living in community with able mentors and peers. It is around this assumption that the full liberal arts curriculum is planned and inherited, and in this total experience lies the best justification for liberal arts in resident institutions. The provision of such experiences in a Christian environment is a unique opportunity for United Methodist-related colleges.

The view that a person is a whole has been a particular concern of Christians. That view promotes a special approach to education and provides a unique opportunity to serve. In a nation committed to a sharp and definite distinction between church and state, state colleges would seem to be largely prohibited from trying to decidedly influence students in terms of attitude and character development, at least in a religious context. A college of a church has the particular and unique opportunity to relate to the whole person. It can move the questions of value and religious discernment from speculation and analysis to personal application and commitment. The non-church-related college may emphasize cognitive curricula and may be expected to deal with questions of value, philosophy, and religion in an intellectual, objective, and perhaps skeptical manner. On the other hand, a college of the church may be expected to deal with the same issues in the context of a transcendent belief system in ways more immediate to the learner and more directly related to personal decisions.

More than one kind of knowledge is needed in modern times. Public decisions today are increasingly made on utilitarian and technological rationales. The issues, however, in policy areas such as the environment and the use of world resources involve questions of value as well as technology. Issues such as bioeugenics and the definition of death are often discussed in a context limited by technological or pragmatic terms. Clearly there is a compelling need for value-centered inquiry.

Questions about the character and quality of life in institutions are value questions just as they are when asked about life in the larger society. Colleges should analyze policies and missions in terms of the underlying values. Understandably, some institutions place high value on the issue of survival possibly without much thought to appropriate means or the consequences of their actions. However, personnel policies, for example, should reflect the values of the institution, for as part of the total institutional life they constitute exemplar components of the informal curriculum.

Questions of value often turn on the evaluation and balancing of competing claims to legitimacy, authority, or allegiance. Ethical action requires the confrontation of the facts of a situation with an underlying value set. This is essential for the individual to make choices and be responsible for them. Under the best of circumstances, the learning experience enables the student to integrate questions of value, informed by theological understanding, into choices that are confronted contin-

ually. This purpose suggests that in the selection and development of faculty for church colleges, a primary emphasis should be upon the ability to interrelate personal commitment to knowledge. Faculty members who believe in a purposeful creator who is the source and sustainer of values can bring that perspective to the consideration of values in their teaching as well as to their contacts with students outside the formal classroom.

Ends and Means

Colleges may have to limit their purposes to meet any of them well. For some colleges, this may mean a few courses of study done well. For others, it may mean a broad array of courses with some common emphasis and threads among them. The essential point is that too often colleges try to do both rather than either well. They also sometimes try to carry almost every social responsibility any student, faculty, supporter, or administrator suggests.

A college's decision-makers may assert its particular mission and determine achievement of it in several ways. The goal is a program consistent with a given educational purpose and formulated so it can be changed in light of its effectiveness in realizing its purpose. One way to formulate curricula is to begin with broad but reasonably explicit statements of attainments expected of graduates. It is not necessary to state learning outcomes that have direct or isomorphic relationship with instructional activities. Formulating educational intentions and proposing ways by which they can be assessed is the important objective because it allows persons other than the student and the immediate teacher to determine whether such intentions have been accomplished.

An institution might have two complementary sets of educational goals. One would be a common set of proficiencies all graduates would be expected to possess at some minimal level. For the purpose of this discussion, these will be termed "graduation criteria." The other would be the expected environmental effects, here termed "influence goals." These goals would be attitudes or behaviors which result from exposure to the total institutional life (informal curriculum) and would be expected to be more typical of seniors than of freshmen. An example of the first might be acceptable writing in terms of style and logic on a subject with which a student has some familiarity. An example of the second might be greater willingness to persist in democratic processes despite the

ambiguity and tedium often associated with them. If this approach is adopted, every student should be minimally competent in reference to graduation criteria. Student behavior over time will reflect the extent to which the influence goals of the college have been achieved.

If such graduation criteria and institutional influence goals are adopted, everything possible should be done to design instruction and campus environment to enable the student to realize them. The college's formal curriculum should be judged in terms of its effectiveness and efficiency in helping students meet the graduation criteria. The formal and informal curricula ought to be constantly examined for their effectiveness in promoting the institutional influence goals. In general, graduation attainments ought to be amenable to assessment by someone other than the teacher directly involved. At least it ought to be possible to replicate the teacher's judgment of the student's attainments with someone else as the judge. Also, the institution ought to set forth means to monitor systematically typical student attitudes and behaviors to see if influence goals are being cultivated.

If such goals and assessments of them are present, persons within the institution may begin to search for those means that are most likely to bring them about. Educators, like successful scientists, ought to concentrate on "finding order in" rather than "imposing order on." [2] That is, curricula may be formalized out of experience, discovering how students move toward goals they clearly understand and acknowledge.

In an ultimate sense, it is perhaps no more reasonable to separate degree criteria from influence goals than it is to divide human personality into cognitive and affective domains. Nevertheless, for purposes of reaching institutional clarity and consensus it is useful to describe them separately, recognizing that they frequently overlap and contribute to one another. The only basic difference suggested is that every student as an individual would have to demonstrate minimal proficiency judged against the graduation criteria, while one would hope the student body as a whole would come to reflect certain attitudes, values, and behaviors as a result of being a part of the institutional life for a period of time. Further, influence goals are not easily measured directly. Some may only be evaluated by determining whether effort was expended in this pursuit. Others could be examined through surveys of students and graduates

[2] L. Freeman, "The Management of Knowledge: Aspects of Higher Education's Role." 1973, unpublished paper.

and their behaviors. In either event, in these areas it is the conduct of the institution that is to be evaluated in terms of its effect on students, not the attitudes or behaviors of the individual student.

Whether an institution defines its purposes in terms of "graduation criteria" and "influence goals" or takes an entirely different approach, it is important to recognize that liberal arts education is not a fixed phenomenon existing in a vacuum. It is an idea or hope changing its form or expression to meet the needs of its host culture. For example, at one time colleges seemingly had to concentrate on shaking students out of their provincialisms. Now our culture is so mobile and fragmented that the new mission, particularly for colleges of a church, may be to help people to find ways they may cooperate with one another in community and commit themselves to hopes and disciplines transcendent of their individualities. Faculty, administrators, and students in a college of a church should constantly try to describe as explicitly as possible the prevailing cultural values and arrangements of their day and consider how they should be addressed within the curriculum.

The primary concern, then, is the appropriateness and feasibility of turning colleges to examine faithfully their processes in terms of their effects. Such an examination can provide a basis both for improving practice and for determining congruence of intent between institution and sponsor. Educational purposes and intents will vary in content as well as level. Whatever the institution's purpose, making that purpose clear in operational terms should help the college to remain faithful to its agreed-upon mission, to communicate that purpose to the general public and prospective students, and to strive to make internal policies (such as faculty selection, development, and reward) consistent with its purpose.

Church and College

Education disciplined by what is really best for persons has a marvelous sponsor in a church. The United Methodist Church can express its concern for individuals and their fulfillment through liberal arts colleges dedicated to that end. The challenge to the institution is to reflect the primacy of the student's fulfillment in its operation. The definitive sign of integrity in a college of a church is where administrators and faculty find concrete, specific ways to constantly determine whose needs are being served primarily—their's or the student's. There is no duty harder than to love another more than one's self. The more explicit the intents

of the college, the better the college can assess its efforts against its outcomes, and the more the institution is worthy of church support.

But why should a church support a college concerned with liberal arts education? Theologies of churches and congregations vary and so would educational purposes. Yet there remains one clear reason The United Methodist Church should invest in a liberal arts college: United Methodists invariably place high value on the individual. The empowerment of the individual's spiritual, intellectual, aesthetic, emotional, and physical resources is of paramount concern. This is what liberal education is about; it is to help individuals be all they can be in service to their faith or philosophy of life.

Cultural Pluralism and Educational Diversity

Introduction

Diversity is the central distinguishing characteristic of American higher education and is a direct consequence of the pluralism that characterizes American society. Cultural pluralism and independent higher education are to great degree symbiotic. A viable independent sector of higher education is one of several common bases on which both meet. It can link the concerns of different ethnic, regional, and religious groups with particular collegiate programs and institutions reflective of respective group needs and values.

The United Methodist Church should be interested in helping maintain a significant part of American higher education as independent. This civic goal is of the greatest importance for several reasons:

- A strong independent sector of higher education is one of several major estates in American society not controlled by government. Such independent estates help maintain personal and political freedoms.
- Pluralism of cultures is a strength in and of itself in American society. Independent colleges and universities can readily serve the needs of particular ethnic, regional, or religious groups.
- Independent colleges and universities contribute to the quality of higher education in that they: possess greater potential to develop distinct purposes because of their ability to relate to specific constituencies; encourage educational excellence; and provide a bulwark against potential state infringement of academic freedom.

By helping sustain and strengthen the independent sector of American higher education, United Methodists help preserve an independent academic estate, facilitate pluralism in American society, and enhance the quality of higher education.

Cultural Pluralism

Diversity in higher education missions and practices is in large measure dependent on a plural culture—one composed of many groups. The sus-

tenance of distinctive groups within society is in turn dependent on the ability of those groups to educate their young in ways reflective of group values. Whether there should be common education for every person regardless of religious affiliation, national origin, or racial identity, or diverse forms of education reflecting group differences has been a critical question for American educational policy almost from the beginning of the Republic. George Washington advocated a national university to facilitate national unity, while Thomas Jefferson represented the more typical American preference for decentralization, placing his hopes on the states as sponsors of higher education.[1] Centralization versus decentralization, homogeneity or diversity has been a basic and persistent political as well as educational dilemma from the beginning of the nation.

Voluntary Associations

Along with the tradition of variegation among governmental bodies and activity, the United States has maintained a tradition of privateness even in public affairs. That is, a major and distinctive characteristic of our country is the ability of private citizens to form voluntary, private associations to express common concerns and establish organizations and programs to address those concerns. De Tocqueville noted the unique advantages in the American proclivity to form voluntary associations and saw it as critical in maintaining freedom in America. He perceived that a society must either have powerful, authoritative, aristocratic individuals to exert power for definite purposes or make it possible for many independent citizens to exert power through voluntary associations. De Tocqueville saw such associations as vital to the maintenance of democratic government. This meant voluntary associations of all kinds: political, mercantile, religious, and *educational*.[2]

E Pluribus Unum (One Out of Many)

The tensions between homogenity and cultural diversity, between centralization and decentralization, and between public versus private holdings and efforts are at the root of many current dilemmas. Understandably many groups and individuals see egalitarianism and its attendant de-emphasis upon the individual as leading inevitably to a gray, faceless homogeneity presided over by an all powerful central government.

[1] Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith (ed.), *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), I, 148.

[2] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 376-378.

Others see an emphasis upon privateness, decentralization, and diversity as a way of maintaining present barriers which effectively separate many from full economic, political, and social participation in the society.

It was from these tensions that there evolved the American ideal of a society whose continuance depends on the cooperation of individuals on equal terms. The Latin phrase *e pluribus unum* on the banner in the eagle's beak on the Great Seal of the United States is the embodiment of the American ideal of encompassing diverse peoples in one great union.

> The intention was never more than to terminate the traditional practice of privileged groups of taking liberties with the equal liberties of any other group . . . Whatever the field of action—state rights, personal liberty, religious freedom, free enterprise, labor relations, education, the phrase *e pluribus unum* with the emphasis on the *unum* can be said to symbolize it. But the *unum* of the American Idea is not the *unum* of the tradition. It signifies not unity but union, and a design of union where groups and individuals come, severally and collectively, to contract together that all will safeguard equal liberty to each.[3]

A group may be defined as "a family, a clan, a tribe, a nationality, a church, an industry, a state, a nation, a guild, a scientific society, a baseball club, or any other organization for sport or play; or any association of these." A group that lasts long enough to develop a tradition will become a "collectivity with a cultural individuality peculiar to itself."[4] Individuals may enter groups in any number of ways and for a multitude of reasons. Yet the emphasis on groups in our culture does not diminish the individual in any way. The freedom for one to choose inevitably requires this freedom of others to choose and our union stands against domination of individuals by the groups. Neither is our culture characterized by a fixed or frozen pluralism where individuals do not move from one group to another. Groups differ from each other and members flow among them, but they are ultimately teamed together to provide and maintain a social environment which nourishes, assures, and enhances their different and frequently competing values.[5]

For *e pluribus unum* to continue to mean a union of diverse cultures, the American people will deliberately have to try to make it so. In diversity

---

[3] Horace M. Kallen, *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea: An Essay in Social Philosophy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956), p. 180.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 55.

there is freedom, the alternative to do otherwise. The enhancement of cultural pluralism and the preservation of freedom depend on maintaining significant social institutions not under the control of the state. Independent colleges and universities under private control are among the most significant of such institutions. An independent academic estate is critical for the enhancement of America's diverse cultures and the preservation of personal and group freedom.

Educational Diversity

An independent, academic estate is one of several ways, along with a free press and an independent judiciary, to keep all power from falling into one political apparatus however well-intentioned it might be at a given moment in history. Insuring that a significant number of American colleges remain under private control in the United States to educate as respective constituencies see fit is a great civic task, and one to which The United Methodist Church, state governments, and the federal government should be committed. Futhermore, an independent sector of higher education serves not only this great civic purpose, but it is also good for higher education per se.

David Riesman, in reviewing the writings of a number of non-American scholars of higher education, found they consistently praised the diversity in American higher education. They found the American system to contrast sharply with more monolithic systems found in other industrial countries.[6]

Higher education in America is highly diversified in terms of institutional origins, constituencies, and purposes. Though phenomenal growth characterized the state sector in the 20th century, the basic character and variety of American higher education was shaped in the 19th century. At that time many independent and particularly church-related colleges were established. Ninety of the currently extant United Methodist colleges and universities were established before 1900, thereby influencing the present fabric of American higher education. There is no uniform system of higher education in America. In their definitive history of

[6] David Riesman, "The Future of Diversity in a Time of Retrenchment," Convocation Address at Windham College, Vermont (October 19, 1974), p. 1.

American higher education, Brubacher and Rudy summarize the development of institutions in the 19th century as follows:

> American higher education has never been forced to conform to any one uniform pattern of organization, administration, or support. In the United States, there has never been a national ministry of government nor a state church to impose norms of university procedure and control. The vast size of the country and the heterogeneous make-up of its population have made it difficult to establish uniformity in higher learning.
>
> The Dartmouth College Case of 1819 furthered this pluralistic trend by legalizing the existence of a great private sector in American higher education, immune from governmental interference. As might be expected, there followed during the remainder of the nineteenth century the founding of the most diverse types of colleges in every part of the land and a vast multiplication in the numbers of such institutions. This multiplication and diversification of colleges, seen in perspective, was but part of a larger movement for diffusion of knowledge to the people.[7]

State's Respect for Privateness

The right of private citizens to establish colleges not controlled by the state is based on Daniel Webster's arguments and John Marshall's decision on the Dartmouth case. The following passage from Webster's argument about the Marshall Court contains the critical argument for the preservation of non-state interference:

> The case before the court is not of ordinary importance, nor of every-day occurrence. It affects not this college only, but every college, and all the literary institutions of the country. They have flourished, hitherto, and have become in a high degree respectable and useful to the community. They have all a common principle of existence—the inviolability of their charters. It will be a dangerous, a most dangerous experiment, to hold these institutions subject to the rise and fall of popular parties, and the fluctuations of political opinions. If the franchise may be at any time taken away, or impaired, the property also may be taken away, or its use perverted. Benefactors will have no certainty of effecting the object of their bounty; and learned men will be deterred from devoting themselves to the service of such institutions, and from the precarious title of their officers. Colleges and halls will be deserted by all better spirits, and become a theater for the contention of politics. Party and faction will be cherished in

[7] John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968* (Revised and enlarged) (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 61.

> the places consecrated to piety and learning. These consequences are neither remote nor possible only. They are certain and immediate.[8]

There are two assertions in the foregoing passage of particular concern here. First, Webster asserted that privately held colleges serve a public purpose—"useful to the community." Secondly, he argued the charters of these institutions must be respected as inviolable and the privateness of the colleges respected if their purposes are to be best served and if the changing winds of politics are not to divert the colleges from those purposes.

The decision of the Marshall Court in favor of the Webster arguments gave legal protection and public provision for voluntary, private groups to establish colleges to serve their particular purposes and for those colleges not to be amenable to state control. Not only is there a strong tradition for decentralized political/governmental bodies and arrangements in America, but the Dartmouth decision established the role of totally non-governmentally controlled institutions in the exercise of a major influence in the education of the nation.

Purpose and Constituency

Independent colleges have a greater opportunity than do state institutions to direct themselves toward a particular purpose, social need, or constituent group. They can better resist the temptation simply to respond to major political decisions and funding patterns that reinforce growth.

The selection of students and faculty in the light of special purposes or needs is one of the major advantages of the independent college. For example, single sex or ethnically identifiable colleges may be highly desirable for some students given their personal needs and concerns. In any case, the deliberate maintenance of such institutions within the state sector seems unlikely. It is useful to note with Riesman that "...as always in America, religion and ethnicity were intertwined in college-funding, so that in Minnesota, for example, Swedish, Norwegian, and German Lutherans all founded colleges for Lutherans of their ethnic background as well as particular synod."[9]

Unlike state institutions and systems of higher education which must

[8] Hofstadter and Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 211.
[9] Riesman, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

reflect the constituencies of the total state, a private or independent college has a somewhat greater possibility of selecting trustees who support the predominant ethos of the college. For instance, sometimes trustees for the state systems or institutions are apportioned by regions of the state. They may also be appointed on some kind of apportionment by major affiliations such as representing business, labor, government, or agriculture. Whether or not they identify with the purpose of the institution or system may be of little consequence. In fact, they may be expected to view the system or institution with skepticism so as not to be co-opted by it. It remains, therefore, valuable to have an independent sector made up of a variety of institutions governed by trustees devoted to particular purposes which are, in fact, public purposes.

While neither sector is immune from the temptations of growth seemingly for growth's sake alone, there appear to be more direct reinforcers for growth in the state sector than in the independent. To a significant degree, the funding of most state institutions and systems is on some type of capitation base or formula. Such funding tends to reward and thus promote growth, often without regard to either purpose or effectiveness. While there are notable examples of major state institutions maintaining reasonable size despite formula or quasi-formula funding, the fiscal dynamics of independent higher education are more likely to reinforce the need to discipline institutional growth in terms of purpose. If a college of a given size is more likely to meet its particular purpose, there is greater likelihood of the independent college actually limiting itself to that size.

For a given cultural group to survive, it is critical for it to be able to educate its people for the skills needed in the broader culture but also to endear them to their own heritage and people. Institutions are needed that serve the particular needs of particular groups while, at the same time, candidly recognizing the educational strengths and weaknesses of the students and helping them to achieve agreed upon educational goals. By being able to serve this dual purpose, independent higher education is a strong ally of cultural pluralism.

It is widely accepted that to be optimally effective an educational institution must have clear and limited goals, for a social institution that tries to do all things will probably do none well. One of the tremendous problems of massive systems of public education is their inability to obtain enough consensus on educational goals to discipline and shape their educational practice. One of the potential geniuses of the inde-

pendent college is that it often has a well-established constituency and delimited functional goals. The great advantage independent institutions have or should have over state controlled systems is a clearer sense of purpose because they relate to particular constituencies rather than try to serve the needs of the whole society.

Academic Freedom

Many abuses of academic freedom can be cited in the independent as well as state sector of higher education; yet it is widely accepted that the dual system of higher education strengthens academic freedom in each. It is the consensus among academics in the South that had there been no independent sector composed of institutions such as Duke, Emory, and Vanderbilt, the speaker ban law on North Carolina institutions would not have been repealed, for the independent sector has often given the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools the strength to deal effectively with legislatures or governors on such matters. While wealthy donors and members of boards of trustees may have considerable effect upon an independent institution, they generally cannot be as influential as a governor or legislator can be on a given state system or institution of higher education.

Pinnacles of Excellence

State systems of higher education experience constant pressure for leveling within the system. To counter this, there is sometimes an effort to differentiate among institutions in terms of level and mission. Research and graduate institutions are generally much more expensive than undergraduate ones, so a case can be made for differential funding among institutions. On the other hand, an attempt may be made to have differential funding by programs. The intent is not aimed directly at differentiating among institutions per se though in most cases that is its effect. The thesis is that comparable programs ought to be comparably funded. Most or all state institutions have some high enrollment, low-cost programs, but only certain institutions have low enrollment, high-cost programs. Differentiation by level or mission or by program are two of the ways state systems may try to maintain pinnacles of excellence in the face of the pressures constanly exerted upon these systems to make no qualitative distinctions among institutions in terms of faculty salary, program support, and so forth. These pressures, in the name of equity, are very difficult to resist, particularly in times of limited resources. Another of the critical problems now facing state higher education systems is how to maintain state universities that have reached a measure of distinction when they are located in small and often remote

towns, particularly when major population bases are demanding expanded shares of the education dollar.

These problems will become more intense in periods of tight money which are expected in the next few years. Money will become more scarce for two reasons: first, there are other human service agencies competing for state government dollars; secondly, the primary population traditionally related to higher education, the 18 to 24 year old age group, will decline dramatically in the 1980s. Further, the proportions of state budgets devoted to higher education appear to have leveled off and may decline. This trend, along with limited job mobility, may increase the inclination of faculty and other personnel for collective bargaining. Collective bargaining on a statewide basis will surely press for common classification and pay scales for all faculty within the state system regardless of institution or program. All of these forces will be negative influences in terms of diversity within state systems.

In contrast to the pressure on state systems for leveling, private institutions related to particular constituencies are more able to pursue their own unique mission without concern as to how those missions affect other institutions, state or independent. Furthermore, since there is no common funding agent for these schools, the pressures for them to be alike in terms of equal amount of support for programs and common faculty salaries are not present. Depending upon leadership and support, independent institutions have a better chance to be different both from one another and from state institutions.

The two traditional, broad approaches to defining excellence in higher education omit a critical consideration. One approach to academic excellence is defined as how academic peers perceive the quality of an institution's programs as in the Cartter Study for the American Council on Education and successor studies.[10] Another approach is the relative performance of graduates on such tests as the Graduate Record Examination and their success in professional, business, and scholarly pursuits after college. But defining excellence in terms of peer perception and the quality of graduates leaves out the critical consideration of how well the school does with the particular students it admits or the intrinsic quality of its programs as distinguished from their visibility. Colleges that do not rate very high on a traditional scale of academic quality may yet be quite excellent in their service to a particular constituency.

[10] Allan M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966).

The United Methodist Church's concern for pluralism may be reflected in its standards of assessing its colleges. In some instances, United Methodists may deliberately raise certain institutions to high levels of national or regional academic excellence as judged in the traditional way. In other cases, there may be a deliberate effort to assess the quality of certain institutions in terms of "value added" to students or service to particular constituencies. In this case, excellence may be defined more in terms of service rendered than renown gained. The United Methodist Church may support some pinnacles of excellence whether defined in terms of service or traditional criteria in a time when this may be increasingly difficult for state systems of higher education—particularly in undergraduate study. In this way The United Methodist Church could set an example for American higher education of what excellence is when it is defined in terms of missions met, constituencies served, and students effectively taught.

The Diminishing Independent Sector

In general, enrollments of independent colleges and universities have not declined in absolute terms in recent years but have held constant or even increased slightly. But the proportion of the higher education "market" enrolled by independent higher education has moved from about 50% in 1950 to slightly under 25% in the mid-70s. A detailed analysis of why independent higher education has a diminished share of the market and why United Methodist institutions have declined in numbers of students enrolled will be dealt with in another National Commission publication. However, one of the several factors is crucial: independent colleges are essentially competing with governmentally subsidized competitors. Generally, about 70% of the educational and general operating expenses of United Methodist-related colleges is met by fees and tuition. In state systems this figure is often 20% or lower and usually does not exceed 30%. Students in independent institutions and their parents, while paying for the predominant part of their education, are also subsidizing students at the state, low-tuition institutions through their taxes.

Sustaining independent and church-related colleges was easier in a more private economy. In the last quarter century, however, expenditures by governments at all levels have grown greatly relative to the size of the economy as a whole. The proportion of the Gross National Product accounted for by governmental purchases of goods and services increased from 13.3% in 1950 to 22.1% in 1974. Adding subsidies, interest, and

transfer payments to purchases of goods and services, we find that total governmental expenditures increased from 21.3% of GNP in 1950 to 33.0% in 1974.[11] One projection of current economic trends suggests that by the year 2000 governmental spending will account for well over half of our Gross National Product.[12] In other words, in the last 25 years we have witnessed a decline in the relative size of the private economic sector from which independent and church-related institutions have historically drawn crucial support; and, barring a sudden change in government policies, we can expect the relative size of the private sector to shrink even more. Not only is the private economic base being reduced, but state institutions and systems of higher education are now competing more vigorously than ever for private money from individuals, industries, and foundations. Presidents of state institutions no longer view such private donations as "icing on the cake" but as essential in maintaining high-quality institutions. In many cases development offices, going after money from private or philanthropic sources, are supported by tax dollars. In effect, the public is subsidizing state institutions to compete for private monies which have been the lifeblood of independent colleges.

The maintenance of an independent sector of higher education is to some degree related to the maintenance of an independent or private sector of the economy. Unless the growth of government dominance of the economy is slowed, the preservation of an independent "academic estate" will depend on government monies flowing to independent institutions in ways that do not compromise the independent nature of those institutions. If the only agenda were to save such colleges, at the cost of their becoming essentially state colleges with no functional independence, the concerns of pluralism and educational diversity would not be met. Therefore, public policy should encourage private capital to flow to independent colleges and universities and should be judged by whether the independent sector remains truly independent.

Implications for The United Methodist Church

United Methodists have a great heritage in pluralism within the church and have manifested great tolerance for others of different persuasions.

[11] Percentages calculated from data in U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1975*, 96th edition (Washington, D.C., 1975), p. 380.

[12] Roy L. Ash, "Looking Beyond the Budget Deficit," *The Wall Street Journal*, CLXXXVI (July 28, 1975), 6.

They have established hundreds of educational institutions in the United States which were and are quite diverse in terms of constituencies served and the nature of their service. They have supported colleges and schools for particular ethnic groups when it was not popular to do so. They built colleges for academic excellence and helped mediocre colleges improve. They built colleges for service which have been sustained in that role. The United Methodist Church has sustained its own pluralistic system of higher education and in so doing has supported the civic need for an independent educational estate.

In order to continue that service, The United Methodist Church should support public policy wherein the state makes deliberate provisions for maintaining an economically viable but functionally independent sector of higher education. It is important that the state search for ways which meet constitutional prescriptions and which allow distinctly religious colleges and universities to survive. Tax and funding policies should be examined for their impact on the independent sector of higher education. But most importantly, for the sake of the society as a whole The United Methodist Church should directly help to perpetuate an academic estate functionally independent of the state. It may do this by continuing to sponsor, fund, or in some other way remain responsible in a significant way for institutions bent on serving particular missions and particular constituencies.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AFFILIATED WITH THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Adrian College
Adrian, Michigan

Alaska Methodist University
Anchorage, Alaska

Albion College
Albion, Michigan

Albright College
Reading, Pennsylvania

Allegheny College
Meadville, Pennsylvania

American University
Washington, D.C.

Andrew College
Cuthbert, Georgia

Baker University
Baldwin City, Kansas

Baldwin-Wallace College
Berea, Ohio

Bennett College
Greensboro, North Carolina

Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach, Florida

Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Brevard College
Brevard, North Carolina

Centenary College of La
Shreveport, Louisiana

Centenary College for Women
Hackettstown, New Jersey

Central Methodist College
Fayette, Missouri

Claflin College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia

Columbia College
Columbia, South Carolina

Cornell College
Mount Vernon, Iowa

Dakota Wesleyan University
Mitchell, South Dakota

DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana

Dickinson College
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Drew University
Madison, New Jersey

Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Emory and Henry College
Emory, Virginia

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Ferrum College
Ferrum, Virginia

Florida Southern College
Lakeland, Florida

Green Mountain College
Poultney, Vermont

Greensboro College
Greensboro, North Carolina

Hamline University
St. Paul, Minnesota

Hawaii Loa College
Kaneohe, Hawaii

Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas

High Point College
High Point, North Carolina

Hiwassee College
Madisonville, Tennessee

Huntingdon College
Montgomery, Alabama

Huston-Tillotson College
Austin, Texas

Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois

Indiana Central University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Iowa Wesleyan College
Mount Pleasant, Iowa

Kansas Wesleyan
Salina, Kansas

Kendall College
Evanston, Illinois

Kentucky Wesleyan College
Owensboro, Kentucky

LaGrange College
LaGrange, Georgia

Lambuth College
Jackson, Tennessee

Lawrence University
Appleton, Wisconsin

Lebanon Valley College
Annville, Pennsylvania

Lindsey Wilson College
Columbia, Kentucky

Lon Morris College
Jacksonville, Texas

Louisburg College
Louisburg, North Carolina

Lycoming College
Williamsport, Pennsylvania

MacMurray College
Jacksonville, Illinois

Martin College
Pulaski, Tennessee

McKendree College
Lebanon, Illinois

McMurry College
Abilene, Texas

Meharry Medical College
Nashville, Tennessee

Methodist College
Fayetteville, North Carolina

Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi

Morningside College
Sioux City, Iowa

Morristown College
Morristown, Tennessee

Mount Union College
Alliance, Ohio

Nebraska Wesleyan University
Lincoln, Nebraska

North Carolina Wesleyan U.
Rocky Mount, North Carolina

North Central College
Naperville, Illinois

Ohio Northern University
Ada, Ohio

Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio

Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Otterbein College
Westerville, Ohio

Oxford College of Emory
Oxford, Georgia

Paine College
Augusta, Georgia

Pfeiffer College
Misenheimer, North Carolina

Philander Smith College
Little Rock, Arkansas

Randolph-Macon College
Ashland, Virginia

Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Reinhardt College
Waleska, Georgia

Rocky Mountain College
Billings, Montana

Rust College
Holly Springs, Mississippi

Scarritt College
Nashville, Tennessee

Shenandoah College
Winchester, Virginia

Simpson College
Indianola, Iowa

Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Southwestern College
Winfield, Kansas

Southwestern University
Georgetown, Texas

Spartanburg Methodist College
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Sue Bennett College
London, Kentucky

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Tennessee Wesleyan College
Athens, Tennessee

Texas Wesleyan College
Fort Worth, Texas

Union College
Barbourville, Kentucky

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

University of Evansville
Evansville, Indiana

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

University of the Pacific
Stockton, California

Virginia Wesleyan College
Norfolk, Virginia

Wesleyan College
Macon, Georgia

Wesley College
Dover, Delaware

West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

Westmar College
LeMars, Iowa

Westminster College
Salt Lake City, Utah

Wiley College
Marshall, Texas

Willamette University
Salem, Oregon

Wofford College
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Wood Junior College
Mathiston, Mississippi

Young Harris College
Young Harris, Georgia